## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the present Office action, claims 1-15 were examined. Claims 1-15 were rejected. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 3-15 are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

### The Specification

The examiner objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure for exceeding 150 words in length and more than one paragraph. Applicants have herein amended the Abstract so as to overcome the examiner's grounds for objection. The Abstract is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 7-11 and 13-15 as being anticipated by Boden et al. (US 5,930,512). Specifically, the examiner notes that Boden et al. recites each and every element of independent claims 1 and 13 of the present application. While Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's contention, Applicants have herein amended claim 1 and claim 13 by adding additional limitations which more clearly separate the present invention from the teachings of Boden et al.

Before describing the amendments to claims 1 and 13, it is useful to briefly summarize the teaching of Boden et al. as well as the teachings of the present invention as follows. Boden et al. is directed to bringing existing workflow systems like that described in the example "FlowMark" of IBM closer to Web technology. In order to accomplish this, a number of steps and special and/or inverse transformations must be executed (and are therefore described in detail) to bring a workflow process from

the FlowMark world into the Web world and back again, e.g., it is necessary to set up pages with scripting language and HTML, etc. In other words, a user of the system described by Boden et al. must be quite knowledgeable and proficient in the scripting language as well as in extended HTML. Therefore, to summarize, though actual control and data flow can be given by a graph as in Boden et al., the setting up of an actual workflow requires substantial programming work.

It is precisely the complication arising from the additional need for programming in Boden et al. to which the present invention is directed with the intention to avoid. The user of the present invention requires no knowledge of programming and no understanding of what happens behind the graphically displayed control and data flow. This is achieved by three features:

(1) The workflow "kit" consists of a predefined, extendable set or palette of graphical building blocks, i.e. "standard elements" stored in a computer, wherein each of such graphical building blocks is self-explanatory and "intelligent". The kit may even, if necessary, initiate a preferably automated dialog for defining and requesting any additional information required.

(2) During the prototyping step, the graphically developed and displayed prototype can be directly animated and tested without any translation or transformation.

(3) Similarly, the implementing step consists of simply uploading, without any compilation or transformation, the tested prototype onto a server or network and the designed process can then be executed.

It is of note that Boden et al. neither teaches nor recites any elements directed to the features detailed above.

With the present invention, even a relatively untrained person can design Web applications and workflows in a truly graphical way without any recourse to programming. Also, a direct switching between the implementation and the design prototype becomes possible without the many manually controlled steps and transformations required by Boden et al. No semantic gaps have to be overcome between the various representations (FDL, HTML, CGI, etc.) because in the process according to the present invention there are no such semantic gaps. The graphical model or prototype designed from and with the elements of the process palette actually is the implementation and need only be loaded onto the server to obtain the run-time solution or application.

Summarizing, contrary to the Boden et al. solution, the present invention requires no semantic difference between the running implementation and the prototype modelling: the model is the solution. Furthermore, the graphical model according to the present invention comprises all details necessary for the application and no other programs need be invoked. Lastly, the present invention incorporates the integration of content management as noted in claim 2. The examiner allows that Boden et al. does not teach such an element. The integration of content management enables a user to set up a multi-language application and thus opens new ways for creating complete Web applications including workflows in a graphical way without the need for any programming.

Returning now to the examiner's grounds for rejection, Applicants respectfully respond as follows. With respect to claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 2, specifically, "said application is defined by more than one process or process model, in particular by a

process or process model supporting content management of said application". In addition, claim 1 now recites the limitation "obtaining directly and without transformation a run time implementation of said application by..." As noted above, Boden et al. fails to teach either of these elements. As a result of this amendment, Applicants therefore transverse the examiner's grounds for rejection. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Similarly, claim 13 has been amended to include the limitation "means for directly executing said design prototype without programming" and "... directly and without compilation as run-time implementation of said application..." As noted above, Boden et al. fails to teach either of these elements. Applicants therefore respectfully traverse the examiner's grounds for rejection with respect to claim 13. Claim 13 is now believed to be in condition for allowance. As all of claims 3-4, 7-11, 14, and 15 depend upon claims 1 and 13, claims 1 and 13 now believed to be in condition for allowance, all such claims are likewise believed to be in condition for allowance.

In addition to the amendments noted above, claim 13 is further amended the additional verbiage making clear that the process model is a "graphical" process model so as to more clearly and distinctly point out the elements of the present invention.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

The examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 6 and 12 as being unpatentable over Boden et al. in view of IBM Corp (hereinafter IBM).

As noted above, the claims of the present application have been amended to include additional limitations neither taught nor suggested by either Boden et al. or IBM taken alone or in combination. Likewise, the above-noted amendments are neither taught nor suggested by Bimson et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0046244 A1). As a result of the above amendments, neither Boden et al. nor IBM nor Bimson et al., taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the elements of the present invention as claimed. Applicants therefore respectfully traverse the examiner's grounds for rejection. Applicants therefore believe that claims 5, 6, and 12 to be in condition for allowance.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

It is submitted that the claims as amended herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

HEINZ LIENHARD ET AL.

By _____
Jeffrey R. Ambroziak
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 47, 387
Tel: (203) 777-6628
Fax: (203) 865-0297

Date: April 13, 2004

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on April 13, 2004

_____
Antoinette Sullo